

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE CONFIRMATION NO. 08/19/2003 10/643,688 Paul W. Scarberry 4204-00013 5091 **EXAMINER** 26753 7590 12/30/2005 ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP PASCUA, JES F

100 EAST WISCONSIN AVENUE, SUITE 1100 MILWAUKEE, WI 53202

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3727

DATE MAILED: 12/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/643,688	SCARBERRY, PAUL W.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
· ·	Jes F. Pascua	3727 .
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2003. 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims		
 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 		
Application Papers		
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. 		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 		
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/19/03, 5/2/05.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Di 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	
S. Patent and Trademark Office	_	

Application/Control Number: 10/643,688 Page 2

Art Unit: 3727

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-14, drawn to a continuous web of bags, classified in class 383, subclass 37.
- II. Claims 15-21, drawn to a method of placing products into a bag, classified in class 53, subclass unknown.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 2. Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product such as a sponge counter during a surgical procedure.
- 3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 4. During a telephone conversation with applicant's representative, Mr. Joseph D. Kuborn, on 12/21/2005 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-14. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 15-21 have been withdrawn from further

consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Milano and Dahlem.

Milano discloses the claimed device, especially the continuous web of bags comprising a base material of paper, which inherently exhibits deadfold properties, being adhered to a plastic film. See column 8, lines 18-24. However, Milano does not show the base material having a series of die-cuts. Dahlem discloses that it is known in the art to provide a series of die-cuts in the base material of an analogous web of bags. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the base material of Milano with the series of die-cuts of Dahlem, in order to permit the web of bags to used with an automated bagging machine.

Regarding claim 4, Milano and Dahlem disclose the claimed invention, as discussed above, except for the series of die-cuts being openings instead of slits. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

Application/Control Number: 10/643,688 Page 4

Art Unit: 3727

was made to replace the die-cut openings with die-cut slits since the Examiner takes

Official Notice of the equivalence of die-cut openings with die-cut slits for their use in the bag art and the selection of any of these known equivalents to permit filling of the bags would be within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding claims 6 and 13, Milano discloses the claimed invention except that the base material in Milano is paper instead of spun-bonded olefin. Dahlem shows that spun-bonded olefin is an equivalent structure known in the art. Therefore, because these two base materials were art-recognized equivalents at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to substitute the paper base material of Milano for the spun-bonded olefin of Dahlem.

Regarding claim 8, Milano and Dahlem disclose the claimed invention, as discussed above, except for the adhesive material between the base material and the plastic film forming a peelable bond. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a peelable adhesive for bonding the base material to the plastic, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 3727

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jes F. Pascua whose telephone number is 571-272-4546. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Newhouse can be reached on 571-272-4544. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jes F. Pascua Primary Examiner Art Unit 3727

JFP